DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 062 633 AC 012 612

AUTHOR Whale, W. B.; Brack, R. E.
TITLE The Development of an Instrument to Differentiate Students' Perceptions of Teachers' Bases of Power.
PUB DATE Apr 72
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented to Adult Education Research Conference (Chicago, Illinois, April 1972)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Learning; Behavioral Science Research; Forced Choice Technique; Interaction Process Analysis; Learning Motivation; *Participant Involvement; *Perception Tests; Social Relations; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Behavior; Teaching Skills; Test Construction

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to review progress in the development of an instrument by which to study the dimension of teacher-student relationships that can be related to power, and by which to study the contribution of this dimension to the learning climate. Sections of the paper are: Theoretical Basis for an Instrument; Development of an Instrument; Testing the Instrument; Examination of Individual Statements; Next Steps in Instrument Development; and Use of the Instrument. The value of the instrument will be to test hypothesis based on a notion that the expectations of the teacher that the student brings to the learning situation and the quality of the relationship that develops between student and teacher during the learning situation may be the most critical factors in successful implementation of designs. Appendix A provides the Instrument to Differentiate Students' Perceptions of Teachers' Bases of Power; Appendix B is a Master List of Items; and Appendix C is Perceptions Differentiations. A brief list of references is provided. (DB)

ED 062 633

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT TO DIFFERENTIATE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS' BASES OF POWER

by

W. B. Whale, Associate Professor of Continuing Education,
University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada

R. E. Brack, Associate Professor of Continuing Education,
University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada

Presented to Adult Education Research Conference, Chicago

April, 1972

AC 012 612

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY W. B. Whale

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT TO DIFFERENTIATE STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS' BASES OF POWER

The purpose of this paper is to review progress in the development of an instrument by which to study the dimension of teacher-student relationships that can be related to power, and by which to study the contribution of this dimension to the learning climate.

Educators generally agree that to start where the students are with respect to subject matter is a first principle to be considered in developing a learning design. Of primary concern in designing learning experiences is the provision for a relationship between the students and the subject matter that will allow conditions for learning to be achieved. Conditions usually considered of importance are: awareness by the students of the relevance of the subject matter to them; a clear picture by the students of what they are expected to do, or what it is possible to do, with the subject matter; opportunities for the students to practice application of the subject matter or to practice behaviour that is appropriate to the subject matter; opportunities for the students to know how they are progressing in their relationship with the subject matter. Yet the most careful provision of these conditions does not assure success in achieving learning objectives.

Observations of a variety of classes and other types of adult learning events lead to a suggestion that the specific objective a student has for being involved in a learning experience, and the role the student perceives the teacher to play with respect to reaching the objective, can influence whether or not a particular design can be effective in providing for conditions for learning. A student who participates in a class with a primary interest in acquiring knowledge and who perceives that the teacher has the knowledge, behaves differently compared to a student in the same class who has a primary interest in acquiring credit for the class and who perceives that the teacher has the ability to give or withhold the credit. A student who expects the teacher to have the knowledge responds differently to a group discussion method compared to

a student who expects that any member of a class may have the knowledge required to achieve an objective. Such observations suggest that information about student perceptions of the teacher's role in the achievement of their objectives for participating in the learning experience may be as important as information about students' level of knowledge, when establishing designs for most effective learning.

Research to date provides information about social interaction in the classroom such as socio-emotional climate and interpersonal perception.[1] It also provides information about the significance of teacher characteristics upon the classroom climate.[2] Research findings reported, however, do not provide completely satisfying answers to the concerns described above.

Theoretical Basis for an Instrument

The literature of the social sciences shows that power and influence are a general consequence of human interaction. It shows that man is always under influence in some form.[3] Within a democratic society at least, power and influence are exercised by people in the power positions by permission of those being influenced.[4] Within the particular case of the adult education event, permission to influence may be given to the teacher or resource person for different reasons by different people experiencing the same event. French and Raven identified five sources of power that are interpreted to provide a useful theoretical basis for differentiating perceptions students have of their teacher or resource person.[5]

Power is defined as the capacity of one person to modify or control the behaviour of another, or others. French and Raven established that the capacity of a person to influence is determined by one or more sources of power as perceived by those over whom that person would exercise his influence. These sources are defined as follows:

Reward: A person is perceived by others to have, and be able to give, material or social or psychological benefit, that they need or would find desirable.

---

[1] References are included at the end of the paper

Coercive: A person is perceived by others to have sanctions and resources to cause them anguish or to restrict or deny highly desired privileges.

Legitimate: A person is perceived by others to exercise control of their behaviour by virtue of their ascribed position.

Referent: A person is perceived by others to be a desirable model for their own behaviour or is one whose company they enjoy.

Expert: A person is perceived by others to have high levels of knowledge or skill in particular areas of subject matter or performance.

These five sources of power would appear to provide a basis for differing quality of relationships between the person in the power position and the person subjected to the power. They provide a possible explanation for differences in relationships observed between students and teacher in learning experiences. A means of obtaining empirical evidence by which to test that possibility could therefore be of importance.

Development of an Instrument

In order to determine whether or not a student may behave differently, depending upon which of the five bases of power he perceived in the teacher, it is necessary to devise an instrument capable of differentiating the five bases of power within a teaching-learning situation. Logic suggests that each of the five sources of power may be having its influence on any situation at any point in time; that a student would not necessarily perceive the teacher to be operating from one source to the complete exclusion of all others. The question to be answered through data obtained by use of the instrument would therefore be: which of the sources of power is the dominant force affecting the teacher-student relationship. The instrument devised therefore has an objective to be capable of indicating the relative force of each of the sources of power in the students' perceptions of their teacher or

resource person.

A forced choice technique was selected as appropriate to meet this objective. By forcing respondents to make choices between statements that were attributable to different sources of power it would permit collection of data to determine which source of power was exercising the greatest force. It would also provide data to determine the strength of each source of power in relation to each other source of power within any teacher-student relationship being studied. A technique of forced choice from between matched pairs of statements attributable to different sources of power was therefore considered to be more appropriate than alternatives such as rank ordering of statements from different sources of power or developing a Likert-type scale.

Statements were developed to answer the question "why do I allow the leader or instructor in the particular situation I am now experiencing, to influence how I do things or how I feel." The authors prepared statements they felt could be attributable to one or other of the five sources of power as defined. These were reviewed with colleagues. Refinements were made until there was agreement on eight statements that could be attributable exclusively to each source of power.

The forty statements agreed upon were randomized and were presented, together with the definitions of power and of the five sources of power being used in this study, to a total of fifteen educators who had not been exposed to the study up to this point. They were asked to identify to which of the five bases of power each of the statements could be attributed. Appendix A includes the instrument used for this phase of the validation of statements. It also includes the level of agreement among the fifteen educators with respect to which source of power each statement could be attributed. Using this information six statements from each source of power were selected for the next step in validation. At least five of the six statements selected from each source of power had complete agreement. The list of statements selected is included in Appendix B.

The pairing of statements was conducted by randomly pairing each statement with one statement from each of the other sources of power,

without replacement. The result is sixty pairs of statements. Each statement appears four times, each time in a different pairing from a different source of power. For example, each statement designated as a reward power statement appears once with a statement from coercive power, once with a statement from legitimate power, once with a statement from referent power and once with a statement from expert power.

Which statement occupied the primary position in each pairing was determined by a flip of a coin. The order in which pairs were included in the instrument was determined through use of a random numbers table. (The instrument is included in Appendix C.)

Testing the Instrument

Cooperation was obtained from instructors and participants in four different learning situations to test the instrument. The test situations were selected to provide observable variations that might be detected by the instrument. Two of the situations were second-year university classes within which the same subject matter was taught by the same resource person. The resource person had indicated a definite difference between the two classes with regard to the student's relationship to the resource person. In the one class students tended to be very cooperative and responsive. In the other class students lacked responsiveness. The instrument was administered during the last week of classes prior to examinations. Twenty-six students responded to the instrument in each of the two situations.

A third situation was a senior undergraduate university class that included an experiential component within its design for learning. No examination was to be required of students. The instrument was administered during the final session of the term. Twelve students were involved.

The fourth situation was a non-credit class for adults. The class was focussed upon here-and-now problems of participants for which the subject matter of the course had relevance. There were seventeen participants in the event. The instrument was administered during the last of five weekly two-hour sessions.

The authors administered the instrument in three of the situations. A colleague who was familiar with the study and with the purpose of administering the instrument at this time assisted in the fourth situation. It should be noted that a certain amount of resistance to the forced choice technique was experienced. This was overcome by a promise that the rationale for use of the technique for this particular research would be discussed following completion of responses to the instrument. The discussion that did follow was successful in having the rationale understood and accepted by respondents. Data were collected from a fifth situation but were discarded as invalid due to ineffective introduction of the instrument to the potential respondents and thus failure to obtain their serious cooperation. It is obvious that great care in introduction of the instrument will be required to assure the validity of data collected.

A total of eighty-one persons responded to the instrument within the four different situations. In the tables that follow the two second-year university classes are identified as 271-26 and 271-28 respectively. The senior undergraduate class is identified as 480. The non-credit class is identified NC.

The data were tabulated by giving each choice by each student a point. There were sixty choices and therefore sixty points for each student divided among the five sources of power. There were twenty-four statements related to each of the sources of power. The range of scores for each source of power could therefore be from zero to twenty-four. Mean scores were calculated for each source of power within each test situation to provide data for comparisons.

Table I compares the strength of the sources of power in the four test situations. Of perhaps the greatest interest is the comparison of the two second-year university classes taught by the same instructor. The reward and expert sources of power were each having strong and approximately equal influence in the two situations. Coercive source of power had weak but equal force in the two situations. The data suggests that the difference that the instructor had noted with the student-teacher relationship was between the legitimate and referent

sources of power. In the one class the students perceived in the resource person someone after whom they could model their behaviour. In the other the students identified more strongly with the legitimate source of power.

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF STRENGTH OF SOURCES OF POWER
IN FOUR TEST SITUATIONS

Sources of Power	Course Numbers							
	271-26 n=26		271-28 n=26		480 n=12		NC n=17	
	$\bar{x}$	Range	$\bar{x}$	Range	$\bar{x}$	Range	$\bar{x}$	Range
Reward	16.8	7-23	16.2	8-22	15.2	8-21	15.9	10-18
Coercive	1.7	0- 8	1.6	0- 7	1.7	0-11	1.3	0- 5
Legitimate	9.0	4-20	11.1	5-23	11.6	5-24	8.5	2-17
Referent	14.3	5-20	12.8	1-20	14.5	6-20	13.8	4-22
Expert	18.0	13-24	18.0	10-24	16.8	12-23	20.5	15-24

The expectation that expert power would yield a high score in the non-credit course was borne out.

Since participation was completely voluntary and was not creditable toward a credential it was anticipated that only those who were interested in the subject matter would become involved in the non-credit course. A high score in the expert source of power category would therefore follow. The surprise in the findings from the non-credit course was that the score in the referent category was relatively high. It was anticipated that courses of short duration would not provide sufficient time for a referent power-based relationship to develop. The possibility that a problem exists with respect to the referent power category in the instrument will be discussed later under the heading "Next Steps in Instrument Development".

It had been expected that since the instrument had been administered to the second-year university classes just prior to an examination period, there may have been a stronger identification of the coercive source of power

in these two cases. The fact that there was virtually no score for the coercive source of power in any of the situations makes it necessary to give particular attention to this element in further development of the instrument.

From the data collected there was insufficient evidence upon which to base judgments about the category other than that it was inoperative within the situations included in the tests. Judgment as to whether or not the inoperativeness was due to a fault in the instrument will be a focus of experimental testing where the coercive power source will be observable within the situation. Evidence produced in such further testing will be used as a basis for refinement of the instrument. It is considered that further discussion of the coercive source of power with respect to the testing that was the basis of this report is not warranted.

Examination of Individual Statements

If the instrument is performing effectively it would be expected that each statement within a power category would contribute relatively equally to the scores accumulated within that power category. The contribution of each statement to the high scores for each source of power are reported in Tables II through V.

It was considered that the top twenty percent of the scores in each category would provide adequate information for this examination. The tables therefore include a breakdown of scores for sixteen respondents in each power category.

Table II shows that five of the six statements in the reward power category were clustered closely together to indicate relatively equal contribution. One statement, R5,did not contribute equally to high scores in the reward power category. Examination of this statement's performance shows that,with the exception of when the statement was paired with a statement from the coercive category,it was generally rejected, even though the other five reward statements had a high level of acceptance. The statement "the person can help me achieve social status" is therefore suspect. Even though the statement survived

the initial stages of selection there is the possibility that it is not considered relevant within the teaching-learning situatibn and it will be withdrawn from the instrument prior to further testing.

TABLE II

MEAN NUMBER OF TIMES STATEMENTS CONTRIBUTED TO HIGH SCORES - REWARD

Student No.	Score	Statement Number R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6
6	23	4	4	4	4	3	4
47	22	4	4	4	4	2	4
51	22	4	4	4	3	3	4
18	21	4	4	4	4	1	4
19	21	4	4	4	4	1	4
22	21	4	4	4	4	1	4
35	21	4	4	3	4	2	4
8	20	4	3	4	3	3	3
9	20	3	4	4	4	2	3
14	20	4	3	4	4	2	3
26	20	2	2	4	4	4	4
29	20	3	2	3	4	3	4
53	20	4	4	4	4	1	3
54	20	3	4	4	4	1	4
31	19	3	3	4	4	2	3
39	19	3	2	3	3	4	4
Total	329	57	55	61	61	35	59
Mean	20.5	3.6	3.4	3.8	3.8	2.2	3.7

Table III provides the individual scores contributing to high scores in the legitimate power category. The consistency of scores between statements indicate that all statements are making relatively equal contribution in this category.

Tables IV and V indicate that the statements in categories referent and expert respectively, are making relatively equal contribution within the instrument.

TABLE III

MEAN NUMBER OF TIMES STATEMENTS CONTRIBUTED

TO HIGH SCORES - LEGITIMATE

Student No.	Score	Statement Number L1	L2	L3	L4	L5	L6
38	24	4	4	4	4	4	4
42	23	4	4	4	3	4	4
17	20	4	4	4	3	3	2
45	18	2	3	2	4	4	3
50	18	2	4	3	2	3	4
7	17	3	3	3	3	3	2
39	17	2	3	3	3	2	4
40	17	3	3	4	2	2	3
75	17	2	4	4	2	3	2
16	16	3	3	3	3	2	2
25	16	4	2	3	2	2	3
48	16	3	4	3	2	2	2
30	15	3	4	2	2	3	1
47	15	2	4	3	2	2	2
55	15	2	2	3	3	2	3
82	14	2	3	2	2	3	2
Total	278	45	54	50	42	44	43
Mean	17.4	2.8	3.4	3.1	2.6	2.75	2.7

TABLE IV

MEAN NUMBER OF TIMES STATEMENTS CONTRIBUTED

TO HIGH SCORES - REFERENT

Student No.	Score	Statement Number RF1	RF2	RF3	RF4	RF5	RF6
70	22	4	3	3	4	4	4
5	20	2	4	4	4	4	2
29	20	2	4	3	4	3	2
41	20	3	3	3	4	4	3
67	20	2	3	3	4	4	4
30	19	4	4	4	3	2	2
36	19	3	2	3	4	4	3
60	19	4	4	3	3	3	2
63	19	4	3	2	4	3	3
2	18	3	4	3	3	3	2
4	18	3	2	3	3	4	3
25	18	3	3	4	4	3	1
56	18	4	3	3	3	3	2
61	18	3	3	4	4	2	2
66	18	4	2	3	2	4	3
24	17	2	3	3	4	2	3
Total	303	50	50	51	57	52	41
Mean	18.9	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.6	3.25	2.6

TABLE V

MEAN NUMBER OF TIMES STATEMENTS CONTRIBUTED

TO HIGH SCORES - EXPERT

Student No.	Score	Statement Number E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6
16	24	4	4	4	4	4	4
55	24	4	4	4	4	4	4
65	24	4	4	4	4	4	4
68	24	4	4	4	4	4	4
80	24	4	4	4	4	4	4
82	24	4	4	4	4	4	4
28	23	4	4	4	4	4	3
43	23	4	4	4	4	3	4
21	22	4	4	4	4	4	2
57	22	2	4	4	4	4	4
2	21	4	3	4	4	3	3
40	21	4	3	4	3	3	4
52	21	4	4	3	4	2	4
71	21	4	4	4	2	4	3
72	21	2	4	4	4	4	3
78	21	4	4	4	4	1	4
Total	360	60	62	63	61	56	58
Mean	22.5	3.75	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.5	3.6

Next Steps in Instrument Development

The instrument will be adjusted by deleting those statements that are not making a contribution that is consistent with other statements in the category. As discussed earlier, the entire area of coercive power will be examined in detail to determine whether or not there are ways and means by which this source of power can be differentiated when it is known that such a power base is operational.

It was indicated earlier that the consistently high scores for the referent source of power was an unexpected finding. Expectations were that scores in this category would fluctuate between situations at least as much as those in the category of expert power. The question is raised as to whether two of the statements that made the strongest contribution to the referent scores might be confused with expert source of power within the context of the teaching-learning situation. The two statements are "the person does things the way I would like to be able to do them" and "the person provides an example I'd like to follow." They were frequently chosen in preference to

statements from the expert source of power by respondents who were generally choosing statements from the expert category in preference to statements from the referent category. Further testing will be undertaken to determine whether or not the two categories are now mutually exclusive, for example, in situations where it is known referent power is low and expert power is high. Corrections will be implemented as necessary.

Following revisions to the instrument it will be administered to a larger sample of respondents to obtain a volume of data to permit between-statement correlations to be calculated and to permit performance of statistical tests for reliability.

Use of the Instrument

An instrument that can differentiate what source of power a participant in a learning experience perceives in the resource person for that learning experience would facilitate a series of studies that could provide new knowledge of value to improving the teaching-learning climate.

Each of the sources of power may have a different influence upon learner behaviour and thus make a different demand with respect to design for effective learning. For example, an adult may be sent to a course by his employer to improve his potential for advancement within the company. Or, a course may be required within a program leading to a credential. The participants, in either case, need the course but may not see the relevance of the subject matter. Teachers may be seen primarily as having the power to grant or withhold the credential, in other words, as having a power source in the reward or coercive categories. If it can be determined that this is the case it would be useful to find out whether such participants have a primary interest in learning about the system by which the credential can be obtained or in the subject matter that is the content of the course. The hypothesis that would be tested would be: students are most likely to have primary concern for the requirements of the educational system, as articulated by the teacher, and only secondary concern for the subject matter, when they perceive the teacher as having reward or coercive power.

When resource persons are perceived to hold legitimate power the

participants are likely to respond equally to any design for learning the resource person may establish. Acquiescence or amenability that they may show may be construed as being positive response to the learning design and to the subject matter. In reality, the response may be to a perception that there is no alternative. The participants may have "plugged into" the learning design without really becoming engaged in it in a meaningful way. A means to differentiate that a participant perceives legitimate power in the resource person would permit testing of a hypothesis: students are most likely to do only what is required of them in a learning situation where the leadership of the resource person is established from the legitimate source of power.

The referent source of power would be generally accepted as a positive basis for a teacher-student relationship in the learning situation. The relationship would be expected to be such that the participant would become actively involved in the subject matter in an attempt to meet or surpass the expectation of the resource person. The relationship based on referent power may also have its dangers. The student who idolizes his teacher may accept the information and expect to apply it in the same way the teacher does. If this is attempted without consideration for ways in which the student's abilities, social skills or personality characteristics may vary from those of the teacher, there are several undesirable outcomes that may be predicted. The student may be frustrated because the limits of his ability may not permit him to excel at the same level as the teacher. He may be led to judge his own performance using criteria that are unrealistic for him. He may be prevented from developing his individual characteristics that should uniquely form within his abilities and capacities. It would be useful to test the hypothesis: students who perceive the teacher as having referent power will judge their own performance in a subject matter using criteria that disregard the limits of their own ability and capacity.

Expertness would seem to be the ideal base upon which to form a student-teacher relationship within a learning experience. Many learning designs logically rely heavily upon this form of power being perceived. But the hypothesis should be tested: students are most likely to learn

subject matter and apply it realistically to their needs when they perceive the teacher as having expert power.

There is also the possibility that the ideal teacher-student relationship with respect to power may vary depending upon the kind of behavioural outcome which is the objective of the learning session. There might be a difference if objectives are in the cognitive domain rather than in the affective domain. Knowledge may be most effectively learned from one perceived as an expert, irrespective of whether he is liked. Attitude changes, however, may be most effectively brought about by a teacher who is liked or admired by his students. Two additional hypothesis are therefore suggested as worthy of testing: Objectives in the cognitive domain are most likely to be achieved when the dominant source of power perceived by participants in the learning situation is expert.

: Objectives in the affective domain are most likely to be achieved when the dominant source of power perceived by participants in the learning situation is referent.

There may even be situations where a perception of expertness could get in the way of a learning design operating effectively. For example, a teacher may know that some, but not all, of the students within a learning group already have knowledge that is to be included in a particular learning situation. The teacher may design the situation to have at least some of the knowledge coming from the students rather than from himself in order to have everyone involved in a meaningful way. If the students, for whom the knowledge is new, perceive the teacher and not their fellow students as the expert, they may reject the information coming from the students and thus cause the design to fail. It would be useful to be able to test the hypothesis: Students who identify a person, within a learning group, as having expert power will reject knowledge offered by other members of that group.

When considering students' perceptions of power in teachers as a possible influence in effectiveness of learning design it is probably most functional to look upon it as a dynamic phenomenon. The perception by the students of the power teachers hold may be directed initially at

the position teachers hold and not at any individual who holds the position. The perceptions may change as the student-teacher relationship develops. It would be of value to development of effective learning designs to be able to test the hypothesis: Students' perception of the dominant source of teacher power is in the legitimate category at the outset of any learning experience. The second hypothesis to test would be: As the student-teacher relationship develops the dominant power source will shift from legitimate to either expert, referent, reward or coercive.

SUMMARY

Some progress has been made in the development of an instrument to differentiate the perceptions a student holds of his teacher from a power perspective. Initial testing of a forced choice from matched pairs of statements technique within an instrument indicates that the instrument is capable of making differentiations between whether a student perceives their teacher to hold reward, coercive, legitimate, referent or expert power over them. Some statements included in the instrument are not contributing equally with others. Testing to date suggests that two categories of statements, coercive and referent, may require major renovation to achieve a valid instrument. Revisions will be made to the instrument to attempt to overcome problems revealed in the initial testing. Retesting will continue until a high level of validity and reliability can be documented for the instrument.

The value of the instrument will be to test hypothesis based on a notion that the expectations of the teacher that the student brings to the learning situation and the quality of the relationship that develops between student and teacher during the learning situation may be the most critical factors in successful implementation of designs. Depending upon the outcome of such testing, the conditions for learning may need revision to assure more careful consideration of the quality of teacher-student relationships when learning experiences are being designed.

REFERENCES

1. Withall, John, Lewis, W. W. "Social Interaction in the Classroom," in Gage, N. L. (ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

2. Getzels, J. W., Jackson, P. W. "The Teacher's Personality and Characteristics," in Gage, N. L. (ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

3. Homans, George C. Social Behavior - Its Elemental Forms, New York: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc., 1961, p. 84.

4. Nisbet, Robert A. Community and Power, New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

5. French, John P., Raven, Bertram. "The Bases of Social Power," Dorwin Cartwright (ed.) Studies in Social Power, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1959, pp. 150-165.

Sources Drawn Upon but to Which No Direct Reference is Made

Cartwright, Dorwin, C. "Influence, Leadership, Control," James G. March (ed.) Handbook of Organizations, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1965.

Henry, Nelson, B. The Dynamics of Instructional Groups, Socio-psychological Aspects of Teaching and Learning. The Fifty-ninth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Remmers, H. H. "Rating Methods in Research on Teaching," in Gage, N. L. (ed.) Handbook of Research on Teaching, Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Shaw, Marvin G., Wright, Jack M. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes, Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Verner, Coolie, Planning and Conducting a Survey, Ottawa, Rural Development Branch, October, 1967.

APPENDIX A

Instrument to Differentiate Students' Perceptions of Teachers' Bases of Power

Power:

- The capacity of one person to modify or control the behavior of another, or others.
- The capacity of one person is determined by one or more sources of power, as perceived by those over whom that person would exercise power.

Sources of power:

Reward: A person is perceived by others to have, and be able to give, material or social or psychological benefit, that they need or would find desirable.

Coercive: A person is perceived by others to have sanctions and resources to cause them anguish or to restrict or deny highly desired privileges.

Legitimate: A person is perceived by others to exercise control of their behavior by virtue of their ascribed position.

Referent: A person is perceived by others to be a desirable model for their own behavior or is one whose company they enjoy.

Expert: A person is perceived by others to have high levels of knowledge or skill in particular areas of subject matter or performance.

Following is a series of statements, each of which provides a reason why a participant in any given situation might allow the leader in that situation to influence his behaviour. In the space provided at the left of each statement, identify to which of the five sources of power you would attribute each statement, that is, reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, expert.

Validation Scores*	He or she:
9	has the credentials for the job
15	has up-to-date information
15	can cause me considerable anguish
10	accepted the responsibility
13	can make me feel good about my progress
15	is the person they sent
15	is a person I like being with
15	can cause others to ridicule me
15	can help me gain satisfaction from how much I know
15	has a personality I admire
9	has been given the kind of recognition I would like for myself
14	can take disciplinary action
15	does things the way I would like to be able to do them
10	can help me achieve my objectives
15	provides an example I'd like to follow
9	can help me get higher qualifications
15	has been placed in charge of the group
15	is skilled at getting to the heart of the issue
15	knows how to apply what he knows
12	is a person I like to be seen with
15	can make fun of me
15	is the kind of person I'd like to be
15	was appointed to the position
14	was selected to carry out this job
15	can make me feel that I am doing something worthwhile

*Instrument administered did not include this column.

15	has been given the responsibility in this situation
15	can make me feel inadequate
11	can have me disqualified from my job
15	was assigned to the job
15	can keep me from obtaining higher recognition
14	has the kind of reputation I would like to have
15	can make me feel that I have something to contribute
15	is skilled at identifying alternate approaches to problems
12	is recognized as an authority in the field
10	has a lot of useful experience in the field
15	knows why things are the way they are
12	can keep me from achieving recognition
15	can help me achieve social status
15	can give me a feeling of personal achievement
15	is capable of highly competent performance

APPENDIX B

MASTER LIST OF ITEMS

REWARD	R1	the person can make me feel good about my progress
	R2	the person can help me gain satisfaction from how much I know
	R3	the person can make me feel that I am doing something worthwhile
	R4	the person can make me feel that I have something to contribute
	R5	the person can help me achieve social status
	R6	the person can give me a feeling of personal achievement
COERCION	C1	the person can cause me considerable anguish
	C2	the person can cause others to ridicule me
	C3	the person can take disciplinary action
	C4	the person can make fun of me
	C5	the person can make me feel inadequate
	C6	the person can keep me from obtaining higher recognition
LEGITIMATE	L1	the person is the person they sent
	L2	the person has been placed in charge of the group
	L3	the person was appointed to the position
	L4	the person was selected to carry out this job
	L5	the person has been given the responsibility in this situation
	L6	the person was assigned to the job
REFERENT	RF1	the person is a person I like being with
	RF2	the person has a personality I admire
	RF3	the person does things the way I would like to be able to do them
	RF4	the person provides an example I'd like to follow
	RF5	the person is the kind of person I'd like to be
	RF6	the person has the kind of reputation I would like to have
EXPERT	E1	the person has up-to-date information
	E2	the person is skilled at getting to the heart of the issue
	E3	the person knows how to apply what he knows
	E4	the person is skilled at identifying alternate approaches to problems
	E5	the person knows why things are the way they are
	E6	the person is capable of highly competent performance

APPENDIX C

PERCEPTIONS DIFFERENTIATIONS

Following is a series of paired statements. You are requested to choose the one statement from each of the pairs, that describes best why you allow the leader or instructor, in the particular situation you are now experiencing, to influence how you do things or how you feel. Please mark an X beside the statement of your choice. *SELECT ONLY ONE OF EACH PAIR.*

I allow the person to influence me because:

	*KEY	
1.	RF2	the person has a personality I admire
	E5	the person knows why things are the way they are
2.	L2	the person has been placed in charge of the group
	E5	the person knows why things are the way they are
3.	R2	the person can help me gain satisfaction from how much I know
	L6	the person was assigned to the job
4.	R3	the person can make me feel that I am doing something worthwhile
	C2	the person can cause others to ridicule me
5.	C3	the person can take disciplinary action
	RF4	the person provides an example I'd like to follow
6.	L4	the person was selected to carry out this job
	E4	the person is skilled at identifying alternate approaches to problems
7.	L2	the person has been placed in charge of the group
	RF5	the person is the kind of person I'd like to be
8.	C5	the person can make me feel inadequate
	E6	the person is capable of highly competent performance
9.	R4	the person can make me feel that I have something to contribute
	C4	the person can make fun of me
10.	C2	the person can cause others to ridicule me
	RF3	the person does things the way I would like to be able to do them
11.	RF2	the person has a personality I admire
	C5	the person can make me feel inadequate

*The key is included here to permit identification of power categories of statements from the master list. It was not part of the instrument that was administered.

12. E1 the person has up-to-date information
L5 the person has been given the responsibility in this situation

13. RF1 the person is a person I like being with
E6 the person is capable of highly competent performance

14. L1 the person is the person they sent
C1 the person can cause me considerable anguish

15. L6 the person was assigned to the job
E3 the person knows how to apply what he knows

16. R6 the person can give me a feeling of personal achievement
C6 the person can keep me from obtaining higher recognition

17. L3 the person was appointed to the position
RF3 the person does things the way I would like to be able to do them

18. R6 the person can give me a feeling of personal achievement
E2 the person is skilled at getting to the heart of the issue

19. RF5 the person is the kind of person I'd like to be
E3 the person knows how to apply what he knows

20. R4 the person can make me feel that I have something to contribute
E4 the person is skilled at identifying alternate approaches to problems

21. RF4 the person provides an example I'd like to follow
L5 the person has been given the responsibility in this situation

22. R5 the person can help me achieve social status
RF3 the person does things the way I would like to be able to do them

23. E1 the person has up-to-date information
C4 the person can make fun of me

24. E2 the person is skilled at getting to the heart of the issue
RF6 the person has the kind of reputation I would like to have

25. L1 the person is the person they sent
E6 the person is capable of highly competent performance

26. C6 the person can keep me from obtaining higher recognition
E3 the person knows how to apply what he knows

27. R5 the person can help me achieve social status
C1 the person can cause me considerable anguish

28. L3 the person was appointed to the position
R1 the person can make me feel good about my progress

29. RF2 the person has a personality I admire
R3 the person can make me feel that I am doing something worthwhile

30. L1 the person is the person they sent
R4 the person can make me feel that I have something to contribute

31. L4 the person was selected to carry out this job
R6 the person can give me a feeling of personal achievement

32. E4 the person is skilled at identifying alternate approaches to problems
RF3 the person does things the way I would like to be able to do them

33. C2 the person can cause others to ridicule me
L2 the person has been placed in charge of the group

34. E2 the person is skilled at getting to the heart of the issue
L3 the person was appointed to the position

35. E4 the person is skilled at identifying alternate approaches to problems
C3 the person can take disciplinary action

36. R6 the person can give me a feeling of personal achievement
RF1 the person is a person I like being with

37. C5 the person can make me feel inadequate
L3 the person was appointed to the position

38. RF6 the person has the kind of reputation I would like to have
C1 the person can cause me considerable anguish

39. L5 the person has been given the responsibility in this situation
C4 the person can make fun of me

40. RF2 the person has a personality I admire
L4 the person was selected to carry out this job

41. RF1 the person is a person I like being with
L6 the person was assigned to the job

42. R3 the person can make me feel that I am doing something worthwhile
L5 the person has been given the responsibility in this situation

43. R1 the person can make me feel good about my progress
C5 the person can make me feel inadequate

44. R2 the person can help me gain satisfaction from how much I know
C3 the person can take disciplinary action

45. L2 the person has been placed in charge of the group
R5 the person can help me achieve social status

46. E5 the person knows why things are the way they are
C2 the person can cause others to ridicule me

47. RF4 the person provides an example I'd like to follow
E1 the person has up-to-date information

48. RF5 the person is the kind of person I'd like to be
R4 the person can make me feel that I have something to contribute

49. C4 the person can make fun of me
RF1 the person is a person I like being with

50. R5 the person can help me achieve social status
E5 the person knows why things are the way they are

51. RF6 the person has the kind of reputation I would like to have
L1 the person is the person they sent

52. RF6 the person has the kind of reputation I would like to have
R1 the person can make me feel good about my progress

53. L4 the person was selected to carry out this job
C3 the person can take disciplinary action

54. E3 the person knows how to apply what he knows
R1 the person can make me feel good about my progress

55. RF5 the person is the kind of person I'd like to be
C6 the person can keep me from obtaining higher recognition

56. C6 the person can keep me from obtaining higher recognition
L6 the person was assigned to the job

57. E1 the person has up-to-date information
R3 the person can make me feel that I am doing something worthwhile

58. RF4 the person provides an example I'd like to follow
R2 the person can help me gain satisfaction from how much I know

59. E6 the person is capable of highly competent performance
R2 the person can help me gain satisfaction from how much I know

60. C1 the person can cause me considerable anguish
E2 the person is skilled at getting to the heart of the issue

1. RF2
   E5

2. L2
   E5

3. R2
   L6

4. R3
   C2

5. C3
   RF4

6. L4
   E4

7. L2
   RF5

8. C5
   E6

9. R4
   C4

10. C2
    RF3

11. RF2
    C5

12. E1
    L5

13. RF1
    E6

14. L1
    C1

15. L6
    E3

16. R6
    C6

17. L3
    RF5

18. R6
    E2

19. RF5
    E3

20. R4
    E4

21. RF4
    L5

22. R5
    RF3

23. E1
    C4

24. E2
    RF6

25. L1
    E6

26. C6
    E3

27. R5
    C1

28. L3
    R1

29. RF2
    R3

30. L1
    R4

31. L4
    R6

32. E4
    RF3

33. C2
    L2

34. E2
    L3

35. E4
C3

6. R6
RF1

37. C5
L3

38. RF6
C1

39. L5
C4

40. RF2
L4

41. RF1
L6

42. R3
L5

43. R1
C5

44. R2
C3

45. L2
R5

46. E5
C2

47. RF4
E1

48. RF5
R4

49. C4
RF1

50. R5
E5

51. RF6
L1

52. RF6
R1

53. L4
C3

54. E3
R1

55. RF5
C6

56. C6
L6

57. E1
R3

58. RF4
R2

59. E6
R2

60. C1
E2

ERIC Clearinghouse
JUN 15 1972
on Adult Education